UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/998,389	11/29/2001	Sean Edward Aschen	AUS920010988US1	7327

40412	7590	10/17/2005	EXAMINER

IBM CORPORATION- AUSTIN (JVL)
C/O VAN LEEUWEN & VAN LEEUWEN
PO BOX 90609
AUSTIN, TX 78709-0609

EXAMINER
GELAGAY, SHEWAYE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2137	

DATE MAILED: 10/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 July 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-8,10-14 and 16-20* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1, 3-8, 10-14, 16-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This office action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on July 29, 2005.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12-14, 16 and 18-19 have been amended. Claims 2, 9, and 15

are cancelled. Claims 1, 3-8, 10-14 and 16-20 are pending.

Oath/Declaration

2.   The objection to the Oath in the first office action is withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments filled July 29, 2005 have been considered but are moot in

view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5.   Claims 1, 3-8, 10-14 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Win et al. (hereinafter Win) United States Letter Patent Number 6,182,142 in view of Urano et al. (hereinafter Urano) United States Letter Patent Number 6,202,158.

As per claims 1 and 14:

Win teaches a method of managing invalid password attempts, said method comprising:

receiving a message corresponding to a failed login attempt from a computer system, wherein the message includes a distinguished name; (Col. 10, lines 26-38)

calculating a total failed login attempt number corresponding to the distinguished name; (Col. 10, lines 39-41)

identifying a failed login attempt allowed number; (Col. 10, lines 46-48)

determining whether the total failed login attempt number is greater than the failed login attempt allowed number; (Col. 10, lines 38-41) and

revoking a password corresponding to the distinguished name based upon

determining that the total failed login attempt number is greater than the failed login

attempt allowed number. (Col. 10, lines 41-43)

In addition, Win discloses a distributed architecture where components may be

moved to different servers and replicated on multiple servers to handle increasing

number of users. Multiple servers increase system performance by reducing login

transaction times and increase system reliability by redundancy and increased

availability. (Col. 25, lines 7-16)

Win does not explicitly disclose receiving a message corresponding to a failed

login attempt from one of plurality of computer systems that receives user login request

and summation of failed login attempts corresponding to distinguished name that are

received from the plurality of computer systems.

Urano in analogous art, however, disclose receiving a message corresponding to

a failed login attempt from one of plurality of computer systems that receives user login

request and summation of failed login attempts corresponding to distinguished name

that are received from the plurality of computer systems. (Col. 3, lines 38-44; Col. 4,

lines 53-59; Col. 11, lines 4-19 and lines 44-50)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made to modify the device disclosed by Win to include

receiving a message corresponding to a failed login attempt from one of plurality of

computer systems that receives user login request and summation of failed login

attempts corresponding to distinguished name that are received from the plurality of

computer systems. This modification would have been obvious because a person

having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by,

Urano (Col. 2, lines 48-51) in order to detect the number of computer terminals when

log-in operation are performed from a plurality of computer terminals by using identical

user identification information.

As per claims 3, 10 and 16:

Win and Urano teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Win

further discloses a method comprising:

establishing a secure connection with the computer system that sent the

message; (Col. 3, lines 7-11; Col. 4, lines 60-61; Col. 6, lines 15-16) and

verifying a digital certificate corresponding to the computer system that sent the

message, wherein the digital certificate is included in the message. (Col. 6, lines 8-10;

Col. 18, lines 6-8; Col. 20, lines 31-33; Col. 23, lines 16-19)

As per claims 4, 11 and 17:

Win and Urano teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Win

further discloses a method wherein the determining comprises:

configuring parameters, wherein the parameters include a login tracking period;

(Col. 9, lines 34-37; Col. 10, lines 6-12 and lines 19-22)

storing a record in a failed login data store, the record including the distinguished

name and a timestamp corresponding to a time the message was received; (Col. 10,

lines 32-38 and lines 46-49; Col. 12, lines 46-48) and

removing one or more records from the failed login data store in response to one

or more corresponding timestamps being older than the tracking period. (Col. 10, lines

41-43; Col. 20, lines1-2)

As per claims 5, 7, 12, 18 and 20:

Win and Urano teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Win

further discloses a method wherein the revoking further includes:

preparing a password revocation message, the password revocation message

identifying the distinguished name; (Col. 10, lines 2-4) and

sending the password revocation message to one or more login servers, wherein

the login servers include the computer system. (Col. 10, lines 4-5)

As per claims 6, 13 and 19:

Win teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Win further

discloses a method comprising:

establishing a secure connection to each of the login servers; (Col. 3, lines 7-11;

Col. 4, lines 60-61; Col. 6, lines 15-16) and

including a digital signature identifying a sending computer system in the

password revocation message. (Col. 6, lines 8-10; Col. 18, lines 6-8; Col. 20, lines 31-

33; Col. 23, lines 16-19)

As per claim 8:

Win teaches an information handling system comprising:

one or more processors; (Figure 9, item 904)

a memory accessible by the processors; (Figure 9, item 906)

one or more nonvolatile storage devices accessible by the processors; (Figure 9,

item 908)

a password managing tool to process invalid password attempts, the password

managing tool including:

means for receiving a message from a computer system, wherein the message

includes a distinguished name; (Col. 10, lines 26-38)

means for calculating a total failed login attempt number corresponding to the

distinguished name; (Col. 10, lines 39-41)

means for identifying a failed login attempt allowed number; (Col. 10, lines 46-48)

means for determining whether the total failed login attempt number is greater

than the failed login attempt allowed number; (Col. 10, lines 38-41) and

means for revoking a password corresponding to the distinguished name based

on the determination. (Col. 10, lines 41-43)

In addition, Win discloses a distributed architecture where components may be

moved to different servers and replicated on multiple servers to handle increasing

number of users. Multiple servers increase system performance by reducing login

transaction times and increase system reliability by redundancy and increased

availability. (Col. 25, lines 7-16)

Win does not explicitly disclose receiving a message corresponding to a failed

login attempt from one of plurality of computer systems that receives user login request

and summation of failed login attempts corresponding to distinguished name that are

received from the plurality of computer systems.

Urano in analogous art, however, discloses receiving a message corresponding to a failed login attempt from one of plurality of computer systems that receives user login request and summation of failed login attempts corresponding to distinguished name that are received from the plurality of computer systems. (Col. 3, lines 38-44; Col. 4, lines 53-59; Col. 11, lines 4-19 and lines 44-50)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device disclosed by Win to include receiving a message corresponding to a failed login attempt from one of plurality of computer systems that receives user login request and summation of failed login attempts corresponding to distinguished name that are received from the plurality of computer systems. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by, Urano (Col. 2, lines 48-51) in order to detect the number of computer terminals when log-in operation are performed from a plurality of computer terminals by using identical user identification information.

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See Form PTO-892.

7.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Shewaye Gelagay whose telephone number is 571-272-

4219. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Albert Decady can be reached on 571-272-3819. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shewaye Gelagay
10/05/05

EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER